

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/565,653	KANAYA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	KEATH T. CHEN	1792

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) KEATH T. CHEN.

(3) Stephen Catlin.

(2) Ram Kackar.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 02 April 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 20 and 21.

Identification of prior art discussed: '766

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

*Discussed potential amendment to the claims. Examiner suggested further clarification to the heat treatment. Applicant will try to add method steps according to the discussion. Examiner will consider such additional steps.*

/Ram Kackar/

*[Signature]* 4/2/09